

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to Figure 1.

Attachment: Replacement sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 5-9, 13-15, and 17-21.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because of a typographical error on page 15. Applicant has amended the specification to address the Examiner's concern.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to show the reference numeral 101. Applicant is submitting a corrected drawing sheet.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mackinlay and claims 10-12 and 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mackinlay in view of Levinson. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant's claims are directed to dynamically link a child timeline to a parent timeline "such that when the parent timeline is updated, the child timeline is automatically updated." (Specification, 3:20-24.) Applicant has amended claims 1-9 and 13-21 to specifically recite this quoted language. Claims 10-12 and 22 similarly recite that when a portion of a first timeline (e.g., parent timeline) corresponding to a dynamically-linked second timeline (e.g., child timeline) is modified, the second timeline is modified.

The Examiner relies on Mackinlay as showing the dynamic linking of timelines. In particular, the Examiner believes that Mackinlay's spiral calendar shows such dynamic linking. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Even assuming, arguendo, that the Examiner's assertion that a calendar is a timeline is correct, Mackinlay does not describe that a "child calendar" is automatically updated when a "parent calendar" is updated. First, the only update of a calendar suggested by Mackinlay is the entry window of Figure 3 that contains the insert, delete, change, and clear buttons. This entry window contains information for a single appointment. When an appointment is modified (e.g., change the length of the

appointment), then presumably the daily window and the weekly window are updated to reflect the modified appointment. In some sense, an entry window may be considered a child of a daily window, which may be considered a child of a weekly window. Thus, when the child window is updated, the parent window is updated.


Applicant's claims, in contrast, recite the reverse—that is, when a parent is updated, the child is automatically updated. For example, claim 1 recites "when the parent timeline is updated, the child timeline is automatically updated." Mackinlay neither teaches nor suggests that when a parent window (e.g., a weekly window) is updated, a child window (e.g., an entry window), is automatically updated. Indeed, Mackinlay neither teaches nor suggests that a parent window can be updated in any way except by the user first updating the entry window.

Moreover, applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that "it is well known the calendar and the timeline serve the same meaning and functionalities." In particular, applicant does not understand what the Examiner means by "the calendar and the timeline serve the same meaning." If the Examiner is suggesting that Mackinlay's calendar is a timeline, the Examiner is wrong. As illustrated in the specification, a timeline is a line with dates associated with different positions along the line. Mackinlay neither teaches nor suggests such a line.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Dated: 8/29/05

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Maurice J. Pirio

Registration No.: 33,273

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8548

(206) 359-9548 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant

Attachment